

Application Serial No. 10/631,877
Reply to Office Action of August 23, 2007

PATENT
Docket: CU-3620

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated August 23, 2007, the Examiner states that Claims 11-23 are pending and Claims 11-23 are rejected. By the present Amendment, Applicant amends the claims. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, Claims 11-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Glover et al. (US 4,744,741). Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Glover in view of Watanabe (US 5,196,213). The Applicant has amended the claims and considers that the amendments overcome the rejections.

The 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of Claims 11-23

The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because the Glover reference does not teach, motivate or suggest all of the required elements of the presently claimed invention. The above arguments are equally applicable here in that the Glover reference does not teach each and every claimed limitation of the present invention. Furthermore, since Glover teaches making separate pieces and then fusing these pieces together, then Glover doesn't teach, suggest or motivate the presently claimed apparatus that is configured to make a sub-unit molded product and then to directly mold onto this sub-unit molded product another shape to eventually form a final assembled object.

Independent claim 11 has been amended to require that the front part and the middle parts are separable from each other after said plurality of sub-unit molded products have been formed, indicate that each mold has at least two mold cavities.

Application Serial No. 10/631,877
Reply to Office Action of August 23, 2007

PATENT
Docket: CU-3620

This allows the claimed machinery to be operated such that the complete molded parts are formed in the second cavities by overmolding a second component onto the previously-molded first sub-unit. In other words, the second component is formed on the already-formed first component.

In contrast, Glover teaches an apparatus that allows the assembling of two finished components. Thus, the apparatus disclosed by Glover is not capable of performing this overmolding.

Glover teaches "a symmetrical thermoplastic body or sleeve 1 with a central internal register rib 2, and an internally mounted injection molded elastomeric sealing ring 3 in each end..." (Glover col. 3, lines 58-61). That is, Glover teaches a device that is configured to make separate molded components and, after a rotation of a mold, then these molded components can be fused to each other to make a product.

The Applicant respectfully contends that this Glover apparatus/method is unlike the presently claimed invention (base claim 11), in that the present invention requires a device to be configured to first make a sub-unit molded product and, following a rotation of mold, an assembled object can then be made by molding, not simply fusing them together, another component onto and around a portion of the sub-unit molded product. In summary Glover teaches a device configured to make two or more pieces and then simply fusing these pieces together. In contrast the present invention requires a device configured to make a sub-unit molded product and then configured to fill another mold around this sub-unit molded product to make a singular geometric shape comprising the final assembled object.

Application Serial No. 10/631,877
Reply to Office Action of August 23, 2007

PATENT
Docket: CU-3620

In summary, the present invention requires an apparatus having mold apparatus parts that have front, back and middle profiles in which the mold apparatus parts are configured to be paired together to form a perimeter of a first cavity defined by the mated surfaces of the front and middle profiles in which this first cavity can then be filled to make a sub-unit molded product. The presently claimed apparatus is configured so that this sub-unit molded product is retained on either the front or middle profile of one of the mold apparatus parts in which the mold apparatus part is then alignable so that the back profile and the sub-unit molded product are paired together to form a perimeter of a second cavity. Again, this presently claimed invention is configured so that this second cavity can then be filled with some substance which can then result in forming onto the sub-unit molded product which results in making the final assembled object.

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully asserts that this anticipation rejection based on Glover should be withdrawn because Glover does not teach each and every claimed limitation of the present invention as required in the base claim 11. Since dependent claims further limit their respective base claim, then the Applicant respectfully asserts that this rejection of claims 12-23 should be withdrawn.

The U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection of Claim 19

In the Office Action, claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glover in view of Watanabe (U.S. 5,196,213).

The Applicant respectfully traverse this rejection in part because the Glover and Watanabe references, alone or in combination, do not teach, motivate or suggest all of the required elements of the presently claimed invention. The above arguments are equally applicable here in that the Glover reference does not teach each and every


Application Serial No. 10/631,877
Reply to Office Action of August 23, 2007

PATENT
Docket: CU-3620

claimed limitation of the present invention. Furthermore, the Watanabe reference is used only to disclose a ball-screw mechanism ejector which does not cure the deficiency of Glover. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully contends that the Glover and Watanabe references, alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest or motivate all of the claimed elements of the present invention such as an apparatus that is configured to make a sub-unit molded product and then to mold onto this sub-unit molded product to form a final assembled object. Therefore, this obviousness rejection of claim 19 should be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections are considered overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: December 24, 2007

Edward J. Chalfie, Reg. No. 29,370
Ladas & Parry LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300